

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-4, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torihara et al. (U.S. 6,412,969). Claims 5-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torihara et al. in view of Hosseini (U.S. 6,347,873). Claim 13 is indicated as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph set forth in the outstanding Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Drawings

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 13 and has amended claims 1-12 and 15-16 to obviate the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 1 has been amended to delete "the lighting method". It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) set forth in the outstanding Office Action and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant's amended independent claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 13 and, thus, the subject matter of original claim 13 is required by Applicant's remaining claims. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 13, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 10, 2003

By:



Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707